

In the Drawing

Submitted herewith is a replacement drawing to be substituted for the originally filed drawing.

REMARKS

By the present Amendment, claims 1-10 are cancelled and claims 11-24 are added. This leaves claims 11-24 pending in the application, with claims 11 and 19 being independent.

Substitute Specification

The specification is revised to eliminate grammatical and idiomatic errors in the originally presented specification, and to add an Abstract of the Disclosure. The number and nature of the changes made in the specification would render it difficult to consider the case and to arrange the papers for printing or copying. Thus, the substitute specification will facilitate processing of the application. The substitute specification includes no “new matter”. Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 608.01(q), voluntarily filed, substitute specifications under these circumstances should normally be accepted. A marked-up copy of the original specification is appended hereto.

In the Drawing

A new drawing is submitted adding the legend “FIG. 1”.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Original claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. By the present Amendment, the originally filed claims have been rewritten to avoid the language alleged to be indefinite in the Office Action. All language of the presently pending claims is now believed to be clear and definite.

Thus, the pending claims are definite and comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

New claim 11 combines the limitations of original claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7 to constitute original claim 7 rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and the intervening claims. New claim 19 combines the limitations of original claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 to constitute original claim 9 rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and the intervening claims. Since original claims 7 and 9 are indicated as being allowable if so rewritten, claims 11 and 19 and the claims dependent thereon should be allowable. The record will not be burdened with a comparison of the claims and the cited patents.

In view of the foregoing, claims 11-24 are allowable. Prompt and favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark S. Bicks
Reg. No. 28,770

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, LLP
1300 19th Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
(202)659-9076

Dated: February 27, 2007